

JUL 21 2003

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	No. 01-50390
)	
Plaintiff-Appellee,)	D.C. No. CR-97-01053-DDP
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM*
)	
RAY PRINCE, aka Farid Ashour;)	
Drew Barksdale; Raymond Dyehouse;)	
Robert Goldstein; Maxwell Royce)	
Harris; Tom Larsen; Prience Owens;)	
Prince Owens; Ray Owens; Ray)	
Anthony Owens; Alexander Sallis;)	
Raymond Scott; Anthony Smith;)	
Prince Smith; Prince Anthony Smith;)	
Ray Smith; Ray Anthony Smith;)	
Roger Smith; Tony Smith; Tony Ray)	
Smith; Agent Sebulski,)	
)	
Defendant-Appellant.)	
_____)	

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Dean D. Pregerson, District Judge, Presiding

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Submitted July 11, 2003**
Pasadena, California

Before: KOZINSKI, FERNANDEZ, and RYMER, Circuit Judges.

Ray Prince appeals his convictions for mail fraud and wire fraud. See 18 U.S.C. §§ 1341, 1343, 2. We affirm.

(1) There was probable cause for the search of the automobile at the hotel where Prince was arrested. See California v. Acevedo, 500 U.S. 565, 579, 111 S. Ct. 1982, 1991, 114 L. Ed. 2d 619 (1991); United States v. Elliott, 322 F.3d 710, 715 (9th Cir. 2003); United States v. Green, 962 F.2d 938, 942 (9th Cir. 1992); United States v. Holzman, 871 F.2d 1496, 1504 (9th Cir. 1989). Thus, the district court did not err when it refused to suppress the fruits of that search.

(2) The district court properly permitted Prince to take over self-representation in the middle of the trial. See United States v. Lopez-Osuna, 242 F.3d 1191, 1199-1200 (9th Cir. 2001); United States v. Farhad, 190 F.3d 1097, 1099-1100 (9th Cir. 1999).

(3) Considering the record and the factors involved in determining whether to grant a continuance, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in this case when it denied Prince a late pre-trial and a mid-trial

** The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

continuance. See United States v. Zamora-Hernandez, 222 F.3d 1046, 1049 (9th Cir. 2000); United States v. Garrett, 179 F.3d 1143, 1144-45 (9th Cir. 1999) (en banc); Smith v. Stewart, 140 F.3d 1263, 1272 (9th Cir. 1998).

AFFIRMED.